

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Wednesday, March 20, 1974

[The House met at 2:30 o'clock.]

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table in the Assembly a petition that was presented to me from my constituency. It refers to the problem of a highway west of Lacombe. Unfortunately, on December 20, 1973 two young citizens were killed on this particular stretch of road and the citizens, being concerned, have asked me to petition the Assembly. So I would like to table the customary wording of the petition along with some 3,000 signatures and representations by 40 companies.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 45 The Coal Mines Safety Act

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being, The Coal Mines Safety Act. Mr. Speaker, the bill complements The Coal Conservation Act. The purpose is to secure the observation of safe practices in the coal mining industry, and thus ensure the protection and preservation of the health of those in Alberta engaged in the coal mining industry.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 45 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 38 The Agricultural Pests Act, 1974

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being, The Agricultural Pests Act, 1974. This bill will replace the existing Agricultural Pests Act and will provide a comprehensive and flexible approach for dealing with anything declared a pest or nuisance that affects the agricultural economy in the province.

[Laughter]

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 38 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 38, The Agricultural Pests Act, 1974 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, some 27 students from Worsley Central School, almost 400 miles from here. They are Grade 7 students. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Bob Bruce, Mrs. Bruce and Mr. Gordon Hagen their bus driver. They are seated in the public gallery. I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the members of this Assembly.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you in the Assembly some 50 lively and alert young men and young ladies who are in Grade 9 at St. Vincent School in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Walsh. They are in the public gallery. I would now ask that they rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly some 45 students from the constituency of Edmonton Beverly, some four miles away from here, accompanied by Mr. Gordon Orlick, Mrs. A. Oximitny and Mrs. I. Godberson, three members of the staff. I would ask that they rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly two students from my constituency. Both of them are winners of the My Teacher essay contest that was held during education week. They are Sheila Hallett and Calvin Stranquist and they are accompanied by their fathers. They are in the members gallery. I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to introduce to you and this Assembly the 15th Guide Company from Edmonton Belmont. Thirteen of them, accompanied by their leaders, Mrs. G. Paton and Mr. W. Mundt, are in the members gallery. I should like to ask them to rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

## TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file with the Legislative Assembly the 1974 Spring Runoff Outlook. I might say that the prevailing conditions indicate an extremely high spring run-off potential for many areas.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table three routine statutory filings under three Acts: The Disabled Persons Act, The Old Age Assistance Act and The Blind Persons Act, in each case indicating that no orders in council were passed pursuant to those Acts since the last session.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 285 which I would like to table.

I would also like to table a copy - and the Clerk has the copies for the other members - of the 1973 review of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file two items for the House today. Actually, the first one is a package. It's to help in the deliberations, I trust, in the House on The Alberta

Energy Company Act. It is made up of three things: a copy of the Certificate of Incorporation, a Memorandum of Association and the Articles of Association for the Alberta Energy Company. Copies will be made available for each member.

The second item, Mr. Speaker, is a copy of a letter which has been written by the Government of Alberta to the federal government regarding the recent decision of the Canadian Radio and Television Commission on additional cable TV channels for the City of Edmonton.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, knowing that all hon. members at least think they have a green thumb, I'd like to file a copy of the Alberta Horticulture Research Centre. There are copies available for all interested hon. members.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a statutory report indicating that there were no regulations under The Alberta Gas Trunk Line Company Act.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

##### Department of Mines and Minerals

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to announce today the location of two agencies of our government that will play a most significant role in future resource development in the Province of Alberta.

As all members are aware, this government introduced legislation last year which established the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission. By virtue of the legislation, the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission is charged with the responsibility of selling all Alberta Crown and lessee-owned crude oil. For the first time, the Government of Alberta, through the Petroleum Marketing Commission, is setting the price of crude oil - not the large international oil companies. At current market prices the commission will handle crude oil valued in excess of \$147 million per month. The commission will work with the government to assure a fair-value price for Alberta crude oil, a depleting non-renewable resource, that is owned by the citizens of Alberta.

One of the significant facts in carrying out the transactions of marketing crude oil is that most of the purchasers of Alberta crude oil are located in Calgary. The government has decided, therefore, to locate the operational headquarters of the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission in the City of Calgary.

As members are also aware, the government has given notice of its intention to introduce legislation that will establish the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority. The object of the Authority will be to coordinate the technology and research in order to develop the full potential of the Alberta oil sands.

In recognition of the importance this government places on future development of the Alberta oil sands, it has already committed \$100 million to the Authority for research and technology over the next five years. Considerable research will be required to achieve the major breakthroughs that are necessary to economically recover the synthetic crude oil from the deep sands. The Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority will have the responsibility to establish a fair and equitable method of accumulating and pooling present and future technological developments in this field.

Special liaison will be required between the Authority and the Alberta Research Council - which developed the hot water extraction process now being used where deposits are available through surface mining. In addition, many departments of government, such as Mines and Minerals, Industry and Commerce, Environment and Advanced Education will also require close liaison. Therefore, the government announces that the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority will be located in Edmonton.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the announcement made by the minister, I think one would say, from the standpoint of Edmonton and Calgary, that this is a very balanced announcement.

Commenting on the announcement regarding the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission, we're pleased that the Minister of Mines and Minerals has confirmed the announcement made by the Member for Calgary Bow last Friday, when he indicated that the offices were located on the sixth floor in the Bow Valley Square in Calgary.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, commenting on the announcement with regard to the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, we're pleased the government has made up its mind as to where the head offices are going to be. I would have been more pleased, Mr. Speaker, if there had been some indication in the government announcement that the Town of Fort McMurray would also play an important role in where this research would be carried on.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would have been very pleased if the minister had indicated that the government was going to rely, to a very great degree, upon private initiative and private industry to do a great amount of this research.

#### Department of Health and Social Development

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement in regard to the Alberta Children's Hospital in Calgary, and advise the House that the recommendations made earlier this month by the Calgary Area Hospital Planning Council to develop the child health centre have received the approval of the Alberta Hospital Services Commission.

The commission has written the chairman of the hospital board confirming agreement that the board now proceed with the appointment of an architect to hasten plans for the centre. The House will recall that the government had earlier committed the necessary funds for the proposed capital redevelopment and expansion plans.

The Calgary planning council had recommended that the Alberta Children's Hospital continue its present programs and services and expand services to accommodate children with handicapping conditions. Unnecessary duplication of acute-care programs would be avoided by the development of strong referral relationships between the children's hospital and other hospitals offering pediatric services.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to confirm what I had indicated before and that is, in view of the considerable importance attached to the subject in the City of Calgary, it is my intention to visit with the board and to visit the facility in the near future.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### Beef Subsidy

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the first question of the Minister of Agriculture and ask if the Government of Alberta has been able to trace down the reports emanating from Ottawa that now the federal government has decided to add an additional \$2-a-hundred to the subsidy announced last Friday?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I have been on the phone to Ottawa and I have attempted to get in touch with the federal minister. I have also spoken to other agricultural ministers in Canada. Unfortunately all I can say to the House is that the matter remains in great confusion and chaos. We are today making a submission to the federal Minister of Agriculture that, if it would help to relieve the chaos, we would take over the administration of the program in the Province of Alberta.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the market operating in Calgary today?

DR. HORNER:

Off and on, Mr. Speaker. My information, just before coming into the House, was that they were attempting to get the market going again this afternoon in Calgary and that there was some buying going on. There is a major meeting of the industry, as I mentioned before, tomorrow in Calgary. The hon. Member for Lloydminster will be representing me at that meeting and we would hope that out of it will come some sort of clarity so that our farmers will be able to market cattle again.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, one more supplementary question to the minister. Has it been brought to the attention of the minister that in some yards across the province livestock is selling as much as \$5 a hundredweight below what it was selling last Friday, as a result of this federal government confusion?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition had listened to me yesterday that's exactly what I said, that we've already lost 5 cents of the federal subsidy of 7 cents as it was supposed to be paid. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's ever been a worse bureaucratic foul-up that I've seen.

#### IPSCO

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a second question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the Government of Alberta requested an extension of the option regarding the purchase - of the 20 per cent option on IPSCO?

MR. PEACOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker, our option is still alive and it is alive until April 13.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Bow Valley followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

#### DES\_Ban

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Deputy Premier. I would like to ask the hon. Deputy Premier what steps his government is taking to prevent DES-cattle coming into Canada from the United States and if he would be prepared to ban DES-beef coming to Alberta?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important question, frankly. The whole question of the use of diethylstilbestrol as an additive to cattle feeds was dealt with by the Canadian government and the food and drug people who banned its use in Canada. Its use is also banned in something like 23 other countries around the world in relation to cattle feeding and meat. Therefore, I have had some preliminary discussions with my colleague, the minister of health, to see whether or not, under health regulations, steps should be taken to inform the processing-food trade, primarily in Ontario, that after May 1 they may require a certificate that the meat they are using is DES-free.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

-----

Medicare - Abortions

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Solicitor General. Is it the government's intention to change regulations under Alberta Health Care to prohibit abortions being paid out under the plan?

MISS HUNLEY:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question then. Is the government considering it at this time?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, we consider all kinds of things most of the time.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Has the provincial government received numerous petitions objecting to abortions being covered under the plan?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I don't have a record of the number being opposed to it. Nor do I have a record of the number who are in favour of it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Celanese Canada Plant - Two Hills

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can the minister advise the Assembly why the Alberta government acquired the controlling interest in the Celanese Canada Plant located at Two Hills, on January 1 of this year?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, the question is rather detailed and I would suggest that the hon. member put it on the Order Paper.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister advise the Assembly why there was no public announcement with respect to this acquisition on January 1?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The first question caused me some doubt and the second one confirms it. The question, couched in those terms, is an invitation to debate because the question "why" seeks reasons, and a reasoned reply - one that isn't confined to giving information that is based on facts - is, of course, debate.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can rephrase that question. Can I ask the minister whether or not it is true that no public announcement was made on January 1 or thereafter with respect to the acquisition of the controlling interest of the Celanese plant?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, whether there was a public announcement made or not, I just assume that in the normal course of events it was reported and there wasn't any reason to identify it as a particular outstanding position that the government was taking with regard to Dow taking over the plant and operating it for the following year of 1974.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether it's true that civil servants and area MLAs were asked not to comment on the takeover?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, in the first place I don't think that's true. In the second place, the plant was taken over - so that we clear any misunderstandings in regard to this operation - it was taken over for \$1 when Celanese had given notice to cease and desist operation on December 31, 1973.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, just one final supplementary question. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether or not the decision with respect to the Two Hills plant represents a precedent for other action with respect to ailing industries?

[Interjections]

MR. PEACOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Solicitor General's Department - Staff

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General. Can she report whether any progress has been made on the hiring of a deputy minister and the wardens for which her department has been advertising?

MISS HUNLEY:

I have eliminated a number of those who have applied for the Deputy Solicitor General's position. I would consider that progress because I don't have to re-interview them. I have a number more to interview.

In regard to hiring the wardens, the competition closed on Friday. I understand a number of very excellent candidates presented themselves and they will be interviewed by personnel and officials in my department. Perhaps I may interview some of them myself because of my great interest in the people who join my staff.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the hon. minister's question, can she advise us how many more eliminations there will be before we get a deputy minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. member for Drumheller.

Calgary Drug Information Centre

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the minister advise if his previous comments regarding funding available for the Calgary Drug Information Centre alluded to the contingent grant promised by Calgary Preventive Social Services?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the answer I gave the hon. member before was that after I visited in January with representatives of the Drug Information Centre, alternatives to the funding that had been received through the alcoholism commission were

to be pursued. I have since the understanding that that has been done and that the particular avenue they were exploring was, in fact, the social service program in Calgary.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Is it the intention of the government to take the required action which will facilitate the contingent grant from Calgary Preventive Social Services to the Calgary Drug Information Centre?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my view of the grants that are made under preventive social service programs is that a process is involved which is primarily a system of priority-setting in the local municipality. It would be extremely rare for the Department of Health and Social Development to say to the social service department of any city or town that a particular program that related at all to a preventive social field was not acceptable. And I'm sure that that hasn't been done in this case.

All that is needed, as I see it, is for the City of Calgary to stay within their overall budget guidelines for preventive social service projects which they want to have funded 80 per cent by the province, and go ahead with their grant. It may mean, if I could just add, that despite the large increases in that budget which there have been in the last couple of years, they would have to look very hard at some other projects they are also funding, in order to give the funds to this one. But if it is of high importance they should have no difficulty with that.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. Has the government received communications from Calgary's chief of police asking for support to keep the Calgary Drug Information Centre open?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information at hand. I will take it as notice and try to respond to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

#### Arab Oil Ban

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. the Premier. What effect will the lifting of the ban on the sale of oil by some of the Arab states have on the Canada-Alberta negotiations on the pricing of oil?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that's a very penetrating question. Obviously it will have some impact on it. At the moment, I don't believe I'm in a position to give any sort of a definitive answer to the hon. member, but it is a matter which we're watching and trying to assess and evaluate, having regard to the conflicting information which is available as to the impact of that decision and the timing of those consequences.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Hanna-Cyen followed by the hon. Member for Cypress.

#### Grouse Hunting Season

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Will the minister advise if the 1974 hunting season on sharp-tailed grouse will be closed in east-central Alberta this year?



DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, all of the suggestions that come during the course of the months as a follow-up from the previous hunting seasons are considered by the Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council. Those meetings have just occurred. Those were extensive meetings and developed a very extensive set of recommendations, and I look forward to the Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council recommendations in that regard.

To refresh the memories of anyone who may have forgotten, the Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council is comprised of a number of different organizations across the province, including farm organizations, sportsmen's organizations, tourism, municipal districts and counties, trappers and so forth, and we had expanded that last year. So I do look forward to the recommendations in that regard as well as many other items.

MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. What methods are used to determine the population of sharp-tailed grouse in areas where you do not have wildlife officers stationed?

DR. WARRACK:

The wildlife officers, Mr. Speaker, have an important role as part of the surveys that we conduct on wildlife populations. However, most of that work is done under the supervision of wildlife biologists and the technicians who are hired to assist them. So that even though there might be areas where we do not have a wildlife officer as nearby as both the hon. member and I might like, we are nevertheless in a position where we can do a very close survey of the population situation.

MR. FRENCH:

A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is it possible to take sharp-tailed grouse from areas in the province where they are plentiful and put them into other areas where they have been pretty well depleted?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes it is, Mr. Speaker. The real question, however, comes about during the most dangerous time in the life cycle of the wildlife species that you are transplanting. There is no problem in transplanting them from one area to another, but the question really is: can they survive - usually the winter, the time that's the most difficult for them to survive. So, in terms of the transplant - no problem at all. But in terms of whether or not their survival can then take place followed by reproduction, that's a question of the habitat, particularly the winter habitat, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

#### Alberta Oil Prices

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. the Premier. Can the hon. Premier advise the House whether any agreement has been reached with Ottawa in regard to the pricing of oil following April 1?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is, no.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I note, if I might just make this comment, that there was an announcement by the energy minister apparent in the House yesterday in regard to the pricing. Would it reflect fairly accurately what we can expect in pricing following April 1, and I refer, of course, to the price suggested of \$6 to \$7 a barrel?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to respond to that matter at this time.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary question, and I don't want to raise it again; I've raised it once before. But will the hon. the Premier be making an announcement immediately on April 1 to the House? When can we expect a statement to the House on this matter?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, on or before April 1, to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Camrose.

#### Rural Development Hearings

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. minister in charge of rural development. Would the minister consider conducting regional rural development hearings throughout the province in 1974, meeting with individuals, county and urban centres, to obtain input regarding the great concerns that exist in rural Alberta?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, certainly rural Alberta has much going for it and we would be prepared to do anything that would assist in improving the quality of life in rural Alberta.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I just might for the hon. member's information suggest that under the Man and Resources Program very extensive hearings were held throughout the little towns and the big urban areas throughout Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Camrose followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

#### Livestock Mineral Shortage

MR. STROMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. I was wondering if he could advise the House if there has been any change in the livestock minerals situation?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the shortage of minerals is primarily in the phosphate area and my understanding, from my officials, was that the situation should be improving about now and minerals should again be available. I might point out that one of the real shortages that is going to continue is the question of phosphate rock and I would hope that all our budding geologists would be looking for it in Alberta.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister. What change in price will there be now that it's more readily available, or will there be any?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know that the price of phosphate rock which is coming into this country from outside the country is certainly not under the jurisdiction of either Alberta or Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

Smoke Detectors

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Has the department considered making smoke detectors in all rental accommodation mandatory across the province?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the advisory committee to the ministry, with respect to The Uniform Building Standards Act, has this and other considerations before it. These are under regulations of the Lieutenant Governor in Council and will become effective on April 1, and at that point we will be more clear as to how we'll go with respect to some of these matters.

It isn't likely that the government would intercede in that specific way, as the honourable gentleman indicates, by requirement of municipalities to perform in that particular way.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question today to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio. ... [Not recorded] ...

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I had some difficulty hearing the question ...

[Remarks made by Dr. Bouvier, Mr. Adair, Mr. Peacock and Mr. Barton, not recorded. Period of time during which House proceedings not recorded: 1 min. 45 sec.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly that specific item might also be revealed in the budget debate.

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

[Question from Mr. D. Miller and reply of Mr. Crawford not recorded. Time period: 30 sec.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I have the impression that the sound system isn't working.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It's okay now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it on again? If hon. members notice that it's off again and if you wish to suspend the proceedings until it comes back on, perhaps someone could make that suggestion.

Aerosol Cans - Health Hazard

MR. D. MILLER:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker - it sounds like it's on.

Has either the provincial or federal government banned the use of adhesive sprays as a result of studies concluding a relation between the spray and birth defects?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is a rather specific type of question. Once again with particular reference to the narrow issue of birth defects, I don't know the answer. And I'll be glad to look into it for the hon. member.

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is the minister satisfied that federal relations adequately cover potential explosive dangers for aerosol cans?

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member might rephrase that question on some other occasion, but at the moment it just stands as the request for a minister's personal opinion which, of course, doesn't come within the scope of the question period.

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

#### Flooding

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. It refers to the report tabled earlier this afternoon. Would that involve run-off to the point of flooding in the report?

MR. SPEAKER:

The report apparently has been tabled. There would appear to be no advantage to going over its contents during the question period.

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

#### Alberta Crude Oil Pricing

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question today to the hon. the Premier. My question has to do with the present oil negotiations with Ottawa. Who are the top three non-elected officials authorized to act on behalf of the province in negotiations?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would think, in terms of the negotiations, that essentially they are involving myself and the Ministers of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, Mines and Minerals and the Attorney General. As far the officials are concerned, there is a whole multitude of them, so I don't think it is a fair situation to categorize them.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Are some of these officials presently in Ottawa or are we doing all the negotiations at arm's length?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It's a long arm.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, some of the officials who are involved are involved in meetings with federal officials here in the capital today. There is a constant series of meetings going on with regard to the subject, sometimes by telephone, sometimes by correspondence and sometimes by meeting.

MR. DIXON:

My final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, is this: is the Premier or any member of the Executive Council planning to visit Ottawa to see the Prime Minister or other officials in Ottawa regarding the oil price issue prior to the end of the month?

MR. LOUGHEED:

In answer to that, Mr. Speaker, I would say, probably, but I think it's something I can't be definitive about exactly at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary question first, if I could, of the hon. Premier. Can the Premier advise the Assembly whether there is any active and continuing consultation with the Province of Saskatchewan, as the other major producing province, with respect to pricing policy?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is, yes.

Calgary Power - Surcharge

MR. NCTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities and ask him whether or not the government intends to introduce any changes in The Public Utilities Board Act as a result of the request by Calgary Power for a surcharge?

MR. FARRAN:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Continental Can Company

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Had he had any prior notice of the closing down of the Continental Can Company in Calgary - before it closed down?

MR. PEACOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Were any investigations conducted into the closing down of the Continental Can Company in Calgary to determine whether any of the employees may have been deprived of their pension rights in the closing down of that business?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that specific question under advisement for this particular company. This kind of investigation is a constant portion of the work of the Board of Industrial Relations in the Department of Manpower and Labour.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Were any requests made by the company for loans to the Alberta Opportunity Fund prior to closing down?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any. I would check on it and see if they have been to the AOC, but I am not aware of it.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary question. Could the hon. minister advise if any efforts whatsoever were made by his department to see if we can retain that business in the city of Calgary?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, as I say, I'm not aware of it but I'll certainly check with our department and inform the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

Mentally-Retarded Children

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Education. Is the department considering placing mentally-retarded girls and boys back in the normal school system?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure to what specific situation the hon. member alludes. The school systems, as the Assembly knows, are generally run by school boards and each school board has a different approach to the extent to which and the way in which it arranges facilities for children who are disadvantaged. But if the honourable gentleman would like to specify in a return, or delimit more particularly an instance to which he is referring, I would be happy to try to answer the question.

MR. TAYLOR:

I would be glad to do that. The schools to which I am referring are those that are specifically set up to handle mentally-retarded boys and girls who were unable to get by or to do well in the public school system. There is some concern now being expressed that these schools are going to lose their support and the boys and girls are going to be forced back into the normal school system.

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, Mr. Speaker. Certainly we have no intention of changing the existing policy in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray followed by the hon. Member for Vegreville.

Beef Prices

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. I wonder if the minister would advise the House whether 'Dowling's Raiders' are going to ride in the same posse with 'Plumptre's Raiders' to ride herd on the prices of beef in relation to this new subsidy that is being announced by the federal government?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, one thing we will most certainly do is to do everything in our power to make certain that our agricultural producers remain in business and are a viable industry and a great contributor to our province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vegreville followed by the hon. Member for Cypress.

Migratory Bird Damage

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Since today is the first day of spring and the snow will be disappearing, could the minister advise whether he is planning any program for the protection of unharvested grains from migratory birds?

MR. LUDWIG:

Shoot the mice!

DR. WARRACK:

Yes we are, Mr. Speaker. We have a program in that regard and we have recently improved it. As a matter of fact, in November we increased the maximum coverage per acre from \$15 to \$25. We have made that improvement. In light of the problems they have in the hon. member's constituency with crops out over the winter, I am really pleased that we made that improvement.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress.

Coal - Mannix Project

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the hon. minister could give any information to the House in regard to the proposed Mannix project for development of a coal mine in the Grande Cache area and where their market will be for this project?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I just didn't get part of that question. I wonder if the hon. member wouldn't mind ...

MR. STROM:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was asking the minister if he could give the House information as to the Mannix project in the Grande Cache area, the size of operation and where their market is for the coal they will be mining in that area?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to that, since it is on public land. This is at the application stage at the present time. It will be coming before a public hearing April 10 and 11 in Edmonton.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister on that. Will the decision on that be made before the eastern slopes hearings, of which Dr. Wood is the chairman, are concluded?

DR. WARRACK:

The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is no, relative to final decisions on the use of public land for further such developments as contemplated.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 30 - The Wildlife Amendment Act, 1974

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to move second reading of Bill No. 30, The Wildlife Amendment Act, 1974.

As I mentioned at the time of introducing this important bill, Bill No. 30, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of principles embodied in the bill. Primary among these principles, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that there are a number of areas within The Wildlife

Act as it now stands which were in need of clarification for a number of reasons, largely involving wildlife enforcement and also protection of wildlife.

In addition, I did mention at that time, and would like to make more extensive remarks as an important principle in The Wildlife Amendment Act that is before us, on the question of the municipal and county by-law shooting problems. So, Mr. Speaker, I think in going through the bill, Bill No. 30, The Wildlife Amendment Act, 1974, that there are really some four different areas within the focus of the bill.

First of all, I would draw to all hon. members' attention that in the 1972 session we did amend - this Legislature did amend - The Wildlife Act and, in so doing, increased substantially the penalties, the maximum penalties, for violations of The Wildlife Act. The extent of those penalty increases were in the order of 250 to 300 per cent. The reason I mentioned that, Mr. Speaker, is that, as with all bills that are quite detailed and extensive, there are a number of areas where obsolescence sets in due to changing circumstances, due to court cases that are decided, and so forth, so that over a period of time there is an accumulation of need for revision and clarification and tightening of any substantial act such as The Wildlife Act.

I will not pinpoint the various examples of this where, for instance, the situation of a person getting a wildlife certificate and giving false information has been something that has been protected as far as the individual himself or herself is concerned in giving that information. But the loophole in The Wildlife Act as it stands is such that one person can give false information about a second person and the second person false information about the first person, and the final result is that both are able, with false information, to end up with wildlife certificates. As the Act stands now, this kind of situation cannot be prosecuted.

Members will notice as they go through the Act that there are a number of areas where there are changes in the way of clarification, in one case, an outright correction with respect to a misnumbered subsection, that are set out in this Bill No. 30, The Wildlife Amendment Act, 1974. The enforcement provisions then, because of these tightenings and clarifications, will be considerably improved and we can henceforth look forward to a more effective wildlife enforcement situation in Alberta because of some of the amendments contained in Bill No. 30.

There are a number of amendments also, Mr. Speaker, that deal with protections of one kind and another. For example, I would draw - and only by way of example I think, on this particular matter, Mr. Speaker - the hon. members' attention to the additional protections for endangered species under The Wildlife Act.

There is an ongoing conference both within Canada and internationally regarding the question of what species of wildlife should be endangered species because of their population circumstances and concern for their existing in perpetuity and to meet some of the agreements that have been made internationally and then nationally across Canada, and of course Alberta is a part of this. Some of the changes are recommended within The Wildlife Act.

Another area where there is protection afforded to wildlife is what is known, Mr. Speaker, as raptors. Now raptors are meat-eating birds and birds of prey, if you like. We have proposed to the Legislature amendments that can protect against the disturbance of nests, the taking of animals - or birds in this particular case - themselves, and also the nests, as against some of the trafficking that, surprisingly to those who may not be close to the situation, but I know that several hon. members are, does take place. In other words, there is a disturbance of the reproductive opportunity for these birds of prey, for these raptors, that takes place with a view to trafficking in those particular items on a highly, as I understand it, lucrative basis. This is an international kind of thing.

Up to now we did not have adequate protection against that kind of difficulty and we propose it in Bill 30 with the amendments to the present Wildlife Act.

Also, we are concerned, and increasingly so, Mr. Speaker, about the problems of predator or wildlife difficulties and some of these considerations are reflected in The Agricultural Pests Act as introduced today by the hon. Member for Athabasca, Mr. Appleby. In addition we have problems, as I think are very well known to many members of this Legislature, not only with wolves, coyotes and, of course, bears - harkening back to discussions at the fall sitting of 1973 - but also problems with beavers with respect to the build-up of beaver dams that then cause substantial flooding of farm land and considerable difficulty and economic loss to farmers as a result of this. This, too, is within the terms of the kind of protection we want to offer, not only to the wildlife themselves and particularly the wildlife that are in some danger as to their perpetual population and survival in Alberta and in Canada, but also protection as to the damage that can be set up and result from situations caused by wildlife.



I might add, moreover, that with the heavy snow conditions that we have through a great deal of Alberta, including now south-central Alberta with the recent snow storms, the particular dangers due to flooding are more than they would normally be in a typical spring.

I am not sure whether I should properly mention, Mr. Speaker, the following item through a concept of protection necessarily, but it's an interesting instance that members will discover is a part of Bill 30, The Wildlife Amendment Act. That has to do with clarifying the allowing of muzzleloaders for the shooting of big game so long as the calibre is at least .44. The reason for it being of that calibre, Mr. Speaker, is to be sure it is a situation in hunting that can kill and not simply maim animals. It falls, in concept, between the powerful firearms on the one hand and bow and arrow shooting of big game on the other.

As the Act now stands it is not perfectly clear that it's legal to use the old-time muskets or muzzleloaders. There are people who enjoy that additional sporting aspect of hunting wildlife and I think it's quite proper to allow them that opportunity to do so, particularly because the net result as compared with powerful firearms is to allow a better and more sporting chance for the game.

There are amendments also, Mr. Speaker, in the bill that pertain to the Buck for Wildlife program and the handling of the funds both with regard to collection and with regard to the disbursement of these funds. The Buck for Wildlife program was announced in February, 1973, in the Legislature, and what it concerns is fish and wildlife habitat development and maintenance. The basic concept is the collection of an additional dollar - a buck - that is committed to go directly and only for wildlife habitat improvement. This collection has taken place now for the first time in the season that began in 1973 and the yield is \$280,000 to \$300,000 per year because that is the number of fishing and hunting licences that are sold. What we have done, Mr. Speaker, in this regard, to report on the areas of the amended Wildlife Act that pertained to the Buck for Wildlife program, is that we had taken a year to plan how we would use that amount of money for wildlife habitat improvement purposes, and having that plan or design for action on hand we then proceeded to develop the program, announce it and make the collections, so that we were immediately able to use those funds for habitat development and improvement purposes.

Of great interest, for example, having regard to the questions that I was asked both in the fall session of 1973, and again this spring by the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills, Mr. McCrae, is that one of the habitat project development areas that we have undertaken is with respect to pheasant on road allowances in southern Alberta. And it is quite promising, Mr. Speaker, with respect to some of the more artificial protection contrivances that appear will be quite effective in aiding in the habitat effort, as well as the development of further natural habitats largely related to irrigation in southern Alberta, with respect to the pheasant population problems, that I think all of us agree are there.

So there are amendments, Mr. Speaker, to take care of all needs in a very clear way, relative to the effective collections and programmed deployment of the Buck for Wildlife program.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, and I save this matter for last because as a matter of principle in the sense of affecting more people in Alberta than any other amendment that's contemplated in Bill No. 30 proposed to the Legislature, are those amendments that deal with the county and municipality shooting by-law problems. Now basically, the brief history of this situation is, Mr. Speaker, that we have a situation where people go out into the country - and that's not only the people from the urban or city areas who go out into the country - but there are some rural people who go out into different parts of the country and shoot in a rather indiscriminate way, often, as I have described it at least, as vandal shooters in comparison with hunter-sportsmen. The vandal shooters are a really serious problem with respect to the rights of the landowner and with respect to the hunting privileges of the true hunter-sportsman. So as a result of some of the serious difficulties that have been experienced, particularly near heavy population centres, Mr. Speaker, under a particular section of The Municipal Government Act, there have been by-laws passed in some of the municipalities and counties of Alberta, seven to be exact, that dealt with the question of shooting as distinct from the use of firearms for hunting purposes.

There is some question in the minds of a number of people who have spoken in very articulate and persuasive terms to me on behalf of the sportsman, as to, first of all, whether these by-laws are, in fact, legal because they have not been contested in court. Particularly in those instances when Crown land is specifically covered as well in the municipality and/or county shooting by-laws, the case seems even more clear that they are probably not within the law and, if tested in court, would be thrown out.

But in any case, the point above all to recognize is the problem of the shooter, the 'plinker' as he is often called - although the word 'plink' seems to me kind of underestimates the danger that can be involved in this kind of use of powerful firearms.

But the point above all is to recognize that there is a real local problem, a real landowner problem, in the protection of people's property, their personal safety in and around the areas which they occupy and frequent as they go about their business in the counties and municipalities with respect to going to town or going to the fields, using the road allowances that are developed as roads which are their right to use as members of the public.

So, in recognition of these two factors, Mr. Speaker, there has been a very extensive set of meetings that we have had as the Fish and Wildlife Division of the Department of Lands and Forests - and of course that I have been involved in myself on numerous occasions, as have other members of the government, including the Minister of Municipal Affairs - relative to trying to work out a liveable compromise, if you like, between the clear necessity of the personal protection of people and their property, and their rights and privileges as landowners, and at the same time protecting public access for the members of the Alberta public who go out there to hunt the public resource, the wildlife of Alberta. And in their strong stated positions these are very polarized situations.

But the common threat, Mr. Speaker, is the recognition that a solution must be found in order to have a uniform and fair amount of protection to the landowners and people living in those areas, and yet a reasonably accessible situation to the members of the public who go out there to hunt the public resource of wildlife.

We have worked together extensively with sportsmen's groups, particularly the Alberta Fish and Game Association and the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties, which, incidentally, passed a resolution asking that the provincial government devise a set of uniform standards that would lessen the problem of the vandal shooter going out into the municipality and county areas and at the same time be fair, inasmuch as with uniformity the law is the same wherever you go in Alberta.

The difficulty as it stands now - and a number of members of the Legislature on this side, I know, and I suspect on the other side as well, have been in the position of having constituents come to them and say that they were harmlessly going down the road in a nearby county or municipality and were told to get off without any clear warning in terms of signs, in terms of what a possible by-law might include and also, after looking into it, finding that the by-laws vary from area to area, that is to say from county to county or municipality to municipality. They say, how on earth can I comply with the law when there is no way that I can possibly know what it is? So it's a very serious problem, both for the landowner and for the sportsman, and we have worked together in extensive consultations to bring forward what we might refer to as a three-part firearms protection package which is the three amendments contained in Bill No. 30, The Wildlife Amendment Act.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, with that background as to the seriousness and magnitude of the problem, to comment on each part of the three that comprise the firearms protection package which we think can reach a reasonable situation between protection of the landowner and of the people living in the areas who have difficulty with the visiting vandal shooters, and also provide for reasonable public access for the members of the public who have the privilege, as we have in Alberta, to hunt wildlife in the province.

The first of these three items is the amendment that would make the following change, if I can be as clear as possible about it. Up to now The Wildlife Act has dealt only with shooting that pertains to the act of hunting. Let me repeat that. Up to now The Wildlife Act has pertained only to shooting as it pertains to hunting. The first amendment that is proposed here that I want to be as clear as I can about involves a change in concept to this extent; that now with the amendment, the amendment to subsection 2 of Section 20 - with the amendment it would become illegal to discharge any firearm upon or over occupied lands whether or not discharge of the firearm was in the act of hunting. In other words, the change in concept, if you like, is from only dealing with the use of firearms during the act of hunting to dealing with the use of firearms generally, even if not in the act of hunting.

The Wildlife Act, up to now, pertaining to this particular amendment, has referred to the question of using firearms for hunting on occupied lands. The amendment will, in addition, prohibit the discharging of any firearm regardless of whether it's in the act of hunting or not. Elsewhere in the Act itself, the question of occupied lands is defined and it is relative to where people live - to the residences of people on those lands. Occupied lands are within three miles, I believe that's accurate, of the residence of where someone lives.

So, subsection 2 of Section 20 would then be amended to read, "No person shall hunt any wildlife", and here's the change, "or discharge any firearm" - that's the end of the change - "upon or over any occupied lands or enter upon such lands for the purpose of doing so, without the consent of the owner or occupant thereof."

That's the first amendment of the three-part firearms protection package that I wanted to be very, very clear about. I repeat again, if I might, that this was one of the

amendments arrived at after very extensive consultation with sportsmen, and landowners and their representatives in order to have the proper and reasonable kind of protection available to the people, and yet at the same time, leave a reasonable situation in which members of the public could hunt in Alberta.

The second amendment, the second of the three that I'd like again to refer to as the firearms protection package, is the following. And this would be a new subsection, if you are following along with me, of a subsection that is new, being (5.1) to Section 25. That amendment, Mr. Speaker, the second of the three-part package, deals with the discharge of a firearm from or around a developed road allowance in any county or municipality - any county or municipality. In other words, it would then read, "No person shall discharge a firearm from, or cause a projectile from a firearm to pass along or across a developed road allowance ...". Now that refers to the use of a firearm in respect to a development road allowance in counties or municipalities. In other words, the improvement districts, the green zone - special areas are not included - and also it excludes the hunting of game birds with a shotgun so long as the person holds a game bird licence.

I might mention, to reiterate where it does apply and where it does not apply as proposed, that it seems quite clear that the most difficult of circumstances are in counties and municipalities, the more settled and concentrated population areas of Alberta. The need for restriction against firearm use along or across developed road allowances is much greater there. Part of the balance, however, is to not have this restriction of public access and the use of firearms in improvement districts, special areas or, of course, in the green zone. It's entirely possible that the future of Alberta may hold a circumstance such that the additional coverage might need to be made, but it was the consensus judgment after a great deal of consultation that, in fact, the protection in counties and municipalities, all of them, would be a very considerable improvement in the protection as compared with what any provincial statute provides now. In fact, the restriction against the use of firearms for any purpose near occupied land, which is defined in terms of peoples' residences, part one of the three-part package, and secondly, restriction against the use of firearms relative to developed road allowances, are really the primary thrusts of the county and municipal by-laws that there presently are in the Province of Alberta.

Now certainly one could take a very strong position either way at this point revolving around the question of developed road allowance. What is a developed road allowance? We really think that the best solution to it is that in an instance where there is some question in the mind of the person who might have been brought up for prosecution, the evidence can be put before the judge and the decision would be made there. We've traced a number of alternatives in seeking another way to try to nail that down better, but each of them had their serious liabilities. From all the discussions and consultations that took place it was judged that this would be the most reasonable proposition and both the landowner and sportsman would be in a position of having access to the hearing of the judicial system relative to the question of developed road allowance. But I freely admit that there is a source that will require some shaking down and some experience with respect to what would be the most effective and fair implementation of the amendments as proposed.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are the first two of the firearms protection package. The third, Mr. Speaker, is right near the end of the act itself, where we would propose as the third amendment to the firearms protection package, a situation where the council, a local council, could pass "No Shooting" by-laws for a complete area within a county or municipality with the joint consent of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Lands and Forests.

We again tried a number of alternatives with respect to finding possible ways to lay these matters out in legislation and not require the kind of appeal procedure that was involved here, but each found its pitfalls and it was felt that we could be sure of implementing a fair situation in this way, and if the future proved that there were ways we could pinpoint situations more accurately, then future amendment to legislation could be brought forth that would accomplish that.

The kind of thing we are thinking of, Mr. Speaker, is that in addition to the additional firearms restrictions on occupied lands and the restrictions against the use of firearms on developed road allowances in counties and municipalities, there still are some additional situations that have to be covered. For example, there are some instances in Alberta where there is a golf course that is located in a municipality or county. Obviously that would be a blanket area where there should be no shooting of any sort, and that would be immediately agreeable with respect to a blanket prohibition against shooting. Another example that comes to mind would be a garbage dump. There are a few, of course, in all municipalities and counties. It would seem quite clear, unless there were some exception that I can't think of, that it would be necessary to prohibit shooting completely in those instances.

A third example that comes to mind is the example of a local municipal park, where there might be a park that is developed and maintained, for example by the county of

Mountain View, west of Olds through that area. In the instance of a municipal park, it would seem quite clear that especially consistent with the provincial parks provisions as we have them in Alberta, there ought to be blanket prohibition against shooting there.

So the final thing I would add on this third part of the firearms protection package, as we have been able to work it out through extensive meetings, is that the amendment would go into effect upon the date of assent. And just to explain the other date that's mentioned there, the August date, the reason that date is in the act is in order to have the opportunity for discussions and consultation with the municipalities and counties that presently have by-laws; to work out a mutually satisfactory arrangement; and to have some time to do so and fit this into both their planning and ours in terms of local government responsibility and needs for planning these kinds of matters, including new staff. So that was the reason that particular addendum provision is there, in order to have that time frame within which the discussions could take place relative to the existing county and municipal by-laws prohibiting the use of firearms.

Mr. Speaker, I have purposely not gone through these item by item. Many of them are pretty much clarifications and administrative matters that I would be pleased to deal with on third reading which I would understand to be the proper place. But I did want to deal with them in groupings of amendments because there are a large number of them, nearly two dozen, and particularly to make extensive comments on the question of the firearms protection package.

I hope I have been clear. I have tried to be very clear as to what the basic problem was, the nature of the discussions that led to the three-part set of amendments which we presently propose to you in Bill No. 30, and finally to describe each of them in some detail, and I hope clearly.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and all hon. members for your attention.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I understand we are dealing with second reading of Bill No. 30 and that, after listening to the hon. minister, we are using the 'scatter-gun' approach rather than the 'straight-shooter' approach in debating this bill. I got the impression that he wandered all over the wilderness in debating this one. And I wasn't sure he got out when he finished. But that shouldn't change anything with the hon. minister.

I was a little disappointed in the minister's approach to wildlife management because the public is showing more concern for a conservation-oriented attitude. It doesn't matter whether the animal is big or small, whether we have many or that sometimes animals may be at the wrong place to suit the hon. Minister of Agriculture. But a conservation-oriented attitude would be very much appreciated in this department now, Mr. Speaker. The population is growing. We are sort of encroaching on the wilderness and there is some concern that we perhaps may be moving a little too fast. As time goes by, with wide highways being slashed through the wilderness, the big game will be pushed further into the hills and perhaps entirely out of Alberta - and not only pushed out of Alberta, but may just disappear in some areas of this province.

And so we need to be doubly concerned. Just talk and waving about of arms in a sort of academic attitude does not mean achievement, Mr. Speaker. There is a grave difference between what the minister thinks is happening and what a lot of people who are concerned and who travel these areas know is happening. There is a serious concern about depletion. And when the hon. minister mentions the handling of predator wildlife, it does have, according to the best information, a role to play in the complete cycle of animals and our wildlife management in this province.

For instance, I hear about bears being slaughtered and then I read a very reliable article saying that some of the people who were involved were even gutting them so they would go away and die slowly in the wilderness rather than drop dead on the spot so that you have to cart them away. This, Mr. Speaker, is in my opinion something that ought to raise the ire - not only of the hon. minister who is saddled with the responsibility or who is armed with the responsibility of managing this department and being concerned. But he seems to be rather indifferent about the whole thing, Mr. Speaker. I take a dim view of his attitude. I think we perhaps need someone in there who would show more concern because a wild animal in pain and suffering and dying slowly - even though it is big - is just as much a case of cruelty as shooting a small animal and letting it crawl away to die.

I believe a lot of students and children and humanitarian-oriented people are not at all pleased with this. So the minister has to come up with something better than just a casual dismissal of the problem. I know bears have affected the power portion of the economy of this province. But on the other hand, maybe there is a better way and a cheaper way to do this than just to slaughter them, slaughter 700, 800 bears in a season or without count; going around as minister in charge with full knowledge that some of the local people were gutting bears so that they would go away, drag themselves to death away

from the populated area. This is certainly not something we ought to tolerate. And I wonder who one can complain to to see maybe that we can at least have a look of concern. He mentioned other predator animals, wolves, coyotes and beaver. I think the hon. minister ought to have a good long talk with our Hon. Lieutenant-Governor. He might give him a few pointers as to how to take care of animals - we haven't got that much of a surplus. There may be at certain times a concentration in certain areas, Mr. Speaker, but generally speaking throughout Alberta one couldn't say that we are overpopulated with wild animals.

I would also think that perhaps the hon. minister can spend a little time with an illustrious citizen of this province, Mr. Al Oeming. Maybe he will tell him a few things about what these animals are. We shouldn't get a sort of guerrilla warfare attitude towards them and shoot them from behind a vehicle and hope that nobody will know. But this thing came out into public and if there is an embarrassment, then there ought to be.

I see the hon. Deputy Premier is looking at me askance and with a menacing attitude. Maybe we ought to give him the croix de guerre if he shot some, because it takes a lot of nerve to shoot a bear, Mr. Speaker, especially with a muzzleloader. Now that I am on muzzleloaders, I believe the hon. minister ought to review his recommendation about a .44-calibre muzzleloader for hunting. Those of you who have hunted and know what hunting is, sometimes shoot a big animal with a one-shot rifle. You might wing him or you might wound him but you haven't killed him. In fact, you may not have given him a mortal wound ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Or her.

MR. LUDWIG:

... he might drag himself away for several miles and live three or four or five days. Maybe it is time we didn't allow this. But sometimes you need more than one shot. Maybe sometimes you have to put the animal out of its misery.

MR. YOUNG:

On a point of order. Could the hon. member, in commenting upon us in the Assembly here, just clarify whether he really means us as doing this, or whether he is reflecting upon his own experience and using the word "you"?

MR. LUDWIG:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe in the context of my remarks, if the hon. member is in doubt as to who I mean he can have a talk with me outside and I will fill him on the issue, Mr. Speaker. Maybe he should talk - the hon. minister, I am addressing the hon. minister - and so if he is in doubt later on I would be pleased to have a chat with the hon. member. He often seems to be a bit bewildered in this House and I wonder whether he knows which way he is facing.

Now let's get back to muzzleloaders, Mr. Speaker. I doubt whether the hon. minister has had much experience with hunting big game because in recommending muzzleloaders, these are one-shot efforts, unless he's invented a double-barrelled one.

But I believe that we ought to look at the question of the humanitarian aspect of hunting, because no sportsman is going to want to be cruel to animals even though it is good sport to give the animal a chance. But once you wing an animal with a fairly heavy calibre rifle, you might slash him, but in many cases, even the best-placed shots require more than one shot if you are dealing with bear, with moose and with elk. I don't call that sport to maim an animal and then not bother looking for it, because he will probably go ten miles before he lies down and then bleeds to death in four or five days, or becomes infected and dies of some poisoning. So in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we ought to get some advice on it ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Get a doctor.

MR. LUDWIG:

... and talk to people who have some humanitarian attitude towards hunting. At best, it's cruel. But when you talk about maybe giving somebody a more sporting chance, then maybe the hon. minister ought to get a Junior Forest Wardens' course and find out how people who care for animals feel about these things.

We have one more interesting problem. We are back discussing road allowances. He mentions the words, "a developed road allowance." I'd like him to distinguish between a developed road allowance and a road allowance that is fenced-in with somebody's pasture.

Is that a developed road allowance? Who has jurisdiction over leased Crown lands when it comes to using a rifle? Maybe the hon. minister can explain to us in some detail, as he is inclined to do on matters that he is informed on and not so much when you want something specific, to give us a good explanation of what are the rights of people towards Crown land that has been alienated towards landholders in the foothills? I understand now, Mr. Speaker, in becoming more conflict-of-interest oriented, that the hon. Minister of Highways can no longer talk or vote on this issue because he is involved in a conflict of interest in this matter. I hope they will check the legislation in the past to see if he has voted on any matter in which his interests would conflict with the needs of the people.

So Mr. Speaker, this is very much a people's concern - people who buy licences, people who believe that they have an interest in road allowances. So the hon. minister ought to get up and sort of do his bit in explaining this thing in detail.

When we talk about wildlife conservation, I know that sometimes there have been concentrations of animals in numbers that perhaps were not approved by some hon. ministers of the government. But there is a great shortage of certain types of wildlife in this province. We have to see whether we can preserve some of the habitat of these birds, of these animals so that they might have a better chance of multiplying. I just don't mean in those areas specifically roped-off by legislation that this is where the birds are going to be allowed to flourish and we won't have any hunting for a year or two so we feel we are doing everything we can. But there are other birds and animals that are not game animals that are not important to this province. I'm talking about all the dozens and dozens of birds and small animals which flourish throughout the province but have, perhaps, been depleted. I'm looking at, perhaps, a good proper move at this time with the minister who knows these problems - he certainly knows this one, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps all those road allowances, the hundreds of acres of road allowances that have now been used up as pasture, that used to provide good coverage and good breeding grounds for small animals - I'm talking about all the many birds, including game birds and, in fact, maybe some of the predators that are so precious to this province - maybe if we altered our approach to this issue we could increase the areas in which the birds can shelter, can hide and multiply.

So we need to see if we maybe shouldn't bring the Crown lands, the road allowances back under provincial jurisdiction and not allow each province to deal with these matters as it sees fit. They are well-intentioned but they are more influenced by commercial attitudes. Perhaps an influential farmer or group of farmers can convince a municipal councillor that they elected him and they want to use these things because it's a cheap source of profit for them - not so much the acreage, but the fact that they don't have to fence these road allowances. It's very convenient. So I think that I would like to see the money that the municipalities get from these Crown road allowances brought back under the jurisdiction, preferably of the Minister of Lands and Forests. If these road allowances are not going to be used for roads or are incapable of being used for roads, then let's bring them back under one department, a department that will be conservation-oriented, that will be oriented towards preserving and perhaps developing more recreation for the people, and maybe we'll get better value for this land. I know that for the farmer who has them it's a convenience. But if he is saving hundreds of thousands of dollars by not having to fence the land which properly belongs to the people, to the Crown, then maybe we ought to charge him more.

This is a growing concern. This is something that irritates a lot of people. I'm repeating it here because I get pressures, I get complaints and I get people calling me saying, why don't you do something. Of course, the only thing I can do is raise it in this Legislature because the opposition does not legislate. I'm not at all concerned by some answers, that the previous government did it. I think that the population is rapidly increasing. The people are able to go into the wilderness. The people are more concerned about the recreational use of public lands, so the time to do something is now and not to wait until a lot of people are very irate and will be knocking at the hon. minister's door to see that something is done.

I believe that legislation to repeal some of the municipal legislation and to get this valuable land back under provincial government jurisdiction is overdue. We can't go on indefinitely and hope that someday something will happen or the farmer who has this particular road allowance will give it up, because they don't give up. It's the nature of the business that what they lay their hands on they won't give up unless they are obliged to do so.

I'm saying this as sincerely as I can, Mr. Minister, because it does concern me. I feel very annoyed when I ride a horse or want to walk someplace and there is a private fence with a gate and a lock on it and it's a people's road allowance. This annoys a lot of people, to feel that one individual can have the right over everybody else. Generally people who have this kind of land are very possessive and sensitive about anybody walking on their land. Many farmers will invite you and say, if you don't do any damage or if you haven't got a gun you are welcome to walk across. But these people in the foothills who have these road allowances are there ready to stop you and order you off if you do this.

So it's a sort of dog-in-the-manger attitude. We are completely deprived of these areas. It doesn't satisfy a lot of people to say, well, that road couldn't be used anyway, so we may as well use it as pasture. Well, let that be so, but then would the farmers say that because I have 53 acres of road allowances, and I'm using the example of the hon. Minister of Highways who admitted in writing that he has them - for instance if he said, well, because of this I understand the inconvenience, I'm going to allow you a one-mile or half-mile stretch over here so everybody can go to the river and let this thing be a wilderness. Why can't we sort of have an exchange? I don't think that anybody wants to be difficult or inconvenient, but we ought to have some kind of exchange for what somebody else got cheaply, what someone benefits from economically at the expense of the people of the province.

So I'm making this recommendation, Mr. Minister, that maybe we ought to do some horse-trading, if I may coin a phrase, or some road-allowance trading with these people. But I agree, I've been wandering up these places and sometimes you couldn't get through unless you were a climber. But certainly if a farmer wants to have five or six or seven road allowances fenced in with his land, there ought to be some means of either legislation or negotiation to state that he has to provide access to a river. I'm talking about the Bow River. The Bow River is a good recreational river. It's long, it's beautiful, it's mostly clean ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

It's got water in it.

MR. LUDWIG:

... people like to go there. Many people don't want to go, they want to walk along the river. But it is not accessible in a lot of beautiful parts of the river. So I am sincerely urging the minister to take it upon himself to look at this. When he deals with this he should bear in mind that hon. Minister of Highways ought not to vote on this issue because he is disqualified by the conflict of interest rule in this House. It shouldn't be all that difficult then, because those who are personally concerned are sort of silenced, as it were, without the use of any muzzleloaders.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that those are the points that I want to make. I hope that the hon. minister will take my remarks into consideration even though I may have conflicted with his views on some matters, I sincerely believe that he has one of the most important departments in the government and that public attitudes have changed. At least they have from where I am watching it. Public attitudes have changed. The Fish and Wildlife people, the wilderness people are pressing hard, and they're not the kind who quit. They will hang tough and they will keep working on their MLAs. I hope that they'd probably be given a chance to talk to us directly.

I also wish to give the minister some serious criticism about the manner they had, on dealing with this department, about the grant to the Fish and Game people. That was one of the best open-government attitudes to get information directly from people who are involved, and we shut that off because their attitude towards this government has changed. That doesn't alter anything. They're not a large group numerically. We used to get a lot of good information from them. They do work. They spend money and they work and they gather information. They are sort of the self-appointed watchdogs of the interests of the people in conservation and wilderness. That's a pretty good thing, because if we had to appoint a government to do it we'd have a bureaucracy that would cost us a tremendous amount of money. But these people are sincere, they're dedicated and they have a message to tell us. They can't please everybody, but I believe that the manner in which this grant to the Alberta Fish and Game Association was refused, was eliminated, requires a lot of explanation because for instance, grants in every other area were being expanded quite liberally.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair has some great difficulty in connecting this grant with this bill. Possibly the hon. member's remarks might be saved until the estimates for the department in question are up for discussion.

MR. LUDWIG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will mention then, for emphasis on this issue, that a bit of repetition perhaps might achieve its result. With all due respect to the hon. Speaker's ruling, I thought that a very broad approach to this bill was taken by the hon. minister and I would like to exercise the same privilege. But I will abide by your ruling, Mr. Speaker, that you want me to stay on the bill.

As I stated, the hon. minister went all over the wilderness on this one and stopped in it, but perhaps that is his approach to the whole thing.

I've said all that I believe needs to be said by me on this matter. Just for emphasis, Mr. Speaker, I'd like the minister to give us a little more information on his change of attitude towards the slaughter of wild animals. It's not acceptable.

On the question of road allowances, on the question of a conservation-oriented attitude in this whole department, not only with regard to trees and commercial forests, but to animals, big game, small game, and all animals whether they are large or small, we ought to start looking at the fact that we are rapidly depleting our wildlife because of population growth. There will come a time when we can't buy it back. Also, perhaps the minister ought to tell us whether he can give us a stand - his stand, I know what his department's stand is. His department is pretty good when it comes to conservation and desecration of our wilderness. His department is second to none. But I want to know whether the minister hears the department and will tell us whether he's in favour of wide highways along the foothills. What is his stand on it, because that is his responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have just a few comments on Bill No. 30. I find a number of very interesting things contained in this bill. The minister today mentioned endangered species. I believe it was this week that the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills brought up the pheasant situation. Today the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen mentioned the sharp-tailed grouse.

I think it's serious enough. I would like to see the minister personally tour some of these areas and find out the situation for himself. In my area, with the snow three feet deep on the level, I just question whether these grouse and pheasant will pull through the winter. We do have gophers and mice in our area, but no coyotes. I haven't seen one for months nor have I heard one. I often wonder why we haven't had a coyote appreciation day, at least in my area, because they do take their share of gophers and mice. Now I sympathize with the sheep people, and I know that there is a problem there, but there are no sheep raisers in my particular area.

Yesterday in The Albertan I noticed the picture of a little bear born in the Calgary Zoo. I wouldn't give you 5 cents for his chances. The way we're treating bears I don't think this little fellow is even safe in the Calgary Zoo.

I see that Albertans are to be introduced to musket shooting. Picture if you will, Mr. Speaker, one of us out in the woods. We're on a deer track and we're coming close, we feel. We stop. We have all the paraphernalia there, the powder, and so on, and we hear a noise close by. We turn around and there is one of our Native citizens on the same track. He has a brand new rifle, a Weatherby Magnum, perhaps \$400 or \$500. How things have changed.

But I am in favour of this innovation in hunting. I think the bill gives one a desire to go back into history to the colonial days when the musket was used. The gun, the pouch and the powder horn were as necessary to a man as his own clothing. I don't agree with the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View concerning musket shooting. I think it's a good innovation.

There are many terms and phrases that have come from those days that we use today. For instance, lock, stock, and barrel. It meant a thing is accepted in its entirety. The people of those days, once they acquired guns, seldom sold them. The only way they were discarded was when they were worn out. Another phrase was flash in the pan. We use it today. He's a flash in the pan - he makes a big fuss, is noisily enthusiastic, but seldom comes through with results. Kind of reminds me of a present government that I know. The powder would flare up, there'd be an explosion, but the shot wouldn't go anywhere. The shot was a failure.

Other terms that have come down through the centuries are: set your sights high; drawing a bead; primed for the occasion; hold your fire; straight as a ramrod. Just the other ...

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect, the Chair is having very considerable difficulty, notwithstanding an excellent education in the meanings and backgrounds of words, connecting the reminiscing concerning these expressions with the content of the bill. Perhaps the hon. member might relate his debate more closely to the content of the bill.

MR. SORENSON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll keep my powder dry.

We are embarking on a cruel practice, but then any type of shooting with rifles is cruel. Reports from areas in the States, especially in the eastern United States,



indicate that a large number of the animals are crippled. Between 25 to 40 per cent are crippled through this means. I think it should be watched very closely.

Many people who purchase hunting and fishing licences would have the public believe that their licence fees are the sole support of provincial fish and game programs. People purchasing a licence and giving their dollar, the buck for wildlife, believe they are the owners of and the only ones interested in wildlife. The wildlife branch certainly depends on licence fees. However it's only a small part of the actual moneys allocated to run the department. The wildlife belongs to all the people of the province and those people who are buying licences, their moneys are just for the privilege of a harvest of game for their own personal use.

I favour the Buck for Wildlife program, but I think the dollar should just be included in the general fund. In this way the Fish and Game department would no longer feel that it has any great obligation to cater to the sportsman.

I would have hoped that the minister would come up with a program that I mentioned a couple of years ago. That was where farmers could participate in a voluntary program; where they could donate an acre or less - just a small plot of land - and plant it to grain and leave it for a year. They wouldn't burn it. They wouldn't feed it. They wouldn't allow their own cattle to feed on it. The only recognition would be the issuance of a field plaque or a shoulder patch. Children and senior citizens could participate by maintaining birdfeeders, birdhouses and so on.

I noticed in the current issue of Outdoor Life there is a program which has just started in the United States. They call it "acres for wildlife". It tells that the southern railway has given 1,800 acres of right-of-way to the game and fish department. Farmers are also much the same program as I mentioned two years ago.

In closing, I just want to reiterate that the wildlife belongs not only to the sportsman but to the millions of other people and especially to the millions yet unborn. Now it is only natural for many businesses to try to increase the sale of their product. Our minister will have pressure from hardware dealers, sporting goods manufacturers, hunting camp operators, sportsmen's magazines and arms and ammunition makers. If he is going to bow to what they're asking, he'll sit down to a banquet of consequences.

Thank you very much.

MR. LEE:

It just occurred to me while the hon. member was expressing his concerns about hunting, and especially the effects of hunting on those animals which are wounded and crawl away to die somewhere, that one of them might apply here and that is, don't shoot until you see the whites of their eyes.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to stay on the principle of the bill when the bill presents several principles, but I will try, without being specific, to speak in generalities on three or four principles that are involved in the bill.

I wanted to make mention particularly of the definition of sections. There are two of them, one on page 3 and one on page 4. Sections 22 and 37 are referred to and amended. The principle of definition is one that is pretty important. Here we have a situation that unless the definitions are very clear in the definition section of the bill it could be very confusing, because in one section the amendment is to change the word "game" to "big game and game birds" whereas the other section is suggesting that "big game and game birds" be changed to "wildlife". So we have at least three definitions here that pertain to game or game birds. They are general and are used differently by different people. So I think it is very important that we look into those sections and make certain that the definitions are clarified and that they have some publicity, because those people who read the instructions on the big game hunting licences and certificates and so on are not always familiar with the terminology and its full intent according to the Act and the regulations.

Another aspect that I was concerned about and appreciated, Mr. Speaker, was this matter of the protection of raptors and their eggs, and anything else that has to do with the extension and protection of wildlife. So much of the wildlife is diminishing and any kind of legislation that makes provision for the protection and extension of wildlife is to be commended.

Now there is that portion which has to do with the affixing of the tags to the big game that has been killed by the hunter. There is a very small additional amendment that is being suggested that I think, as a matter of principle, needs to be considered. The Act, as it presently reads, requires that the tag be affixed to the animal. The additional amendment suggests that it be affixed and locked. If this is going to be the

case then the lock should be tested in advance. I have known of more than one incident where hunters have been embarrassed by the fact that they went to affix their tag and it refused to lock. They could not fit it in. In taking the tag back on one occasion I personally was faced with the fact that I couldn't have another tag in its place without going to the Edmonton office to get it. This was a bit of an embarrassment and predicament. It didn't bother me so much because I'm not a hunter by nature and I didn't intend to use the tag, but had I had to use it I would have been in a very narrow, straitened circumstance. I am not certain whether I could have convinced the officer that I could not lock it. So if we are going to put in an addition we should certainly be more careful as to the types of tags that are handed out.

The principle of entering a house with a warrant is a matter in the Attorney General's department and I think it is generally considered that you can enter any time with a warrant. For that reason I think it is being suggested, if I read correctly, that the search warrant aspect of the legislation be eliminated because it is already in some other legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that an officer has a warrant doesn't necessarily always mean that he is doing a good job of his searching. I have had more than one experience of wildlife officers with search warrants having exceeded what the warrant required or permitted in their searching. A search warrant, as I understand it, usually indicates what they are permitted to search for. I have seen cases where wildlife officers have taken into their custody things that were not included in the search warrant and this creates a problem. Therefore, just saying that it can be done by warrant is not enough. The law enforcement officers must, for public relations purposes as well as the efficiency of their job, pay careful attention to what the warrant requires of them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I do want to speak a moment or two on that principle of increasing the fines for convictions and the hunting along and across developed roadways. First, with regard to the fines, I think it is a good move to increase the amount of the fine. We have been for a long time now experiencing some rather frustrating situations insofar as landowners are concerned, where people are taken in who have accidentally, or otherwise, shot domesticated animals. The hunter has been fined \$100 or \$200 and his gun and licence have been confiscated temporarily. The animal that he shot was worth \$500 or \$600 and there is no compensation made to the landowner whose animal was shot.

If compensation is made under some of our laws where it can be made, then the taxpayer has to pay for it, not the fellow who has done the hunting, because his fine is not enough to cover the costs to the Crown of compensating the person who lost the animal. Therefore, I am in favour of an increase in the fine. The upper limit is rather high, but I think that repetition of this type of crime requires a rather high penalty in this affluent society in which we live. For there are some of those who hunt in our country who are well-heeled financially, and to whom a small fine is of little consequence and doesn't appear to have any deterring effect.

[Mr. Dixon in the Chair]

I would like to say, further, with regard to the matter of hunting along or across developed road allowances and otherwise on the land, that I think this is a very good move. And I highly favour it, Mr. Speaker.

With regard to the developed road allowances, I think I understand what that means. I have to agree, to a great extent, with the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View when he speaks about the necessity of allowing access to recreational areas on undeveloped road allowances, particularly waterways, in our province, whether they lead to rivers or streams or lakes.

While we are talking about that, I have come across an idea that has been presented to me on more than one occasion recently, and I think it is something I would like to mention at this time. Along the provincial highways the Department of Highways has control, development control, over 1,000 feet on either side of the highway. It has been suggested that somehow the public should have access to waterways for a certain number of feet from the normal high watermark, as well as the high watermark. Presently, as I understand the law, and as most people seem to think it exists, they go along the river at the high watermark and at the high watermark they can walk, but beyond that they are on private territory and they may be trespassing on land that is privately owned. It has been suggested that that should be extended far enough so that they could go along the watercourse without trespassing when the high watermark was there - when the water was up to the high watermark.

I would like also to suggest to the minister that he give consideration not only to making it illegal to shoot a projectile across or along a developed highway in a county and the municipal district, but also there are some improvement districts and special areas right in the centre of our province where the population is just as great as it is in some counties and municipal districts, and where the danger would be just as great in some special areas. So I think it needs to be looked into. If it is going to be left as

it is, then there is a possibility that permission should be given under certain circumstances to extend that same idea on a local level to some of the areas like special areas and improvement districts.

I think for the time being, Mr. Speaker, that is all I will say and I will bring the rest of my comments on the bill when it comes into Committee of the Whole.

MR. McCRAE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a few observations on this bill. I certainly support it in principle. And today, at least, I can say that I agree with the Member for Calgary Mountain View in his observation that the portfolio held by the Minister of Lands and Forests is one of the more important ones in government right now. With the increasing recreational time that so many of our people have, I think it is important that the whole area of fish and game be expanded so that there are better and greater opportunities for hunting and for fishing. In the last several years we have seen quite a serious depletion of the pheasant population.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency I represent has a good many hunters in it, particularly pheasant hunters, and I think that last year was probably the worst season we've seen. I know myself I bought a license. I only had occasion to go out one day, that was opening day, and I suspect we drove in excess of 300 miles without having the opportunity to fire a shot at a cock pheasant. I don't think we were doing anything that particular day that we hadn't done other years. Really the reason we didn't see or shoot anything was because there was very little there. And I think that that was evidenced by the very wise closing of the season by the minister a short couple of weeks later.

I think we are very fortunate in having a minister as energetic and as keen in this area as we do have. I'd like to extend to him my congratulations for the fine work he has done so far and the expectation that he will not only continue the good work, but accelerate it a wee bit.

I certainly support the Buck for Wildlife program. I think it is an imaginative, worth-while program. I think the area of habitat for pheasant game, upland game particularly, is extremely important. With the increasing trend of the farmers to farm right to the edge of their fence line or to the roads themselves, using in many cases part of the road allowance, it is diminishing the habitat and of course causes a concentration of all the animals of prey, plus the upland game, in a very condensed area. This, I suppose, is one of the major reasons for the limited number of birds available for hunting. Also there is some possibility that the fact that the previous administration allowed us to have a season on the hen pheasant may have resulted in a diminution of the pheasant population.

With respect to the wildlife habitat fund and the \$280,000 to \$300,000 per annum that will be flowing into the fund through the sale of licenses, I wonder, first of all, if that will provide a sufficient amount of money in the fund to handle both the area of the pheasant habitat and the fish habitat. I suspect that it will not be. One reason might be that there may not be as wide a sale of licenses this year unless the opportunities for successful hunting are increased. And of course, if there is a lessening of license sales, there will be a corresponding reduction in the number of dollars available. I think perhaps it might be wise and expedient if the government could see its way to tossing in a massive amount of money. I don't know how much is needed, but I do know that something rather drastic has to be done to reverse the trend very shortly, otherwise this valuable recreational opportunity may be lost to us.

Another factor for southern Alberta is the tourist factor. It is certainly important to the motel operators in the small towns, and of course any other merchant in a small town, that this recreational opportunity remain. I think I have seen numbers of \$4 to \$5 million being the amount of money brought into the province by tourists in southern Alberta for and during the hunting season. So I would request that the government give consideration to increasing the number of dollars available in the Buck for Wildlife fund.

I would also suggest that the minister give very serious consideration to working with local fish and game clubs in identifying fields or areas or road allowances where pheasant habitat might be developed and where birds might be dropped with a reasonable expectation that they are not only maturing but going on to become breeding stock in the future. I'm sure many of the fish and game clubs would welcome the opportunity of participating in this program and I'm sure the department already has, or will be expanding the contacts in that area.

One other area I would like to comment on, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the closing of road allowances to hunting in some of the municipalities adjacent to Calgary. This has caused a great deal of concern among the hunters from Calgary. It has been rather a shock to them to buy a license and go out into the country expecting to be able to hunt on road allowance and be confronted by either an officer, a local farmer or a sign indicating that we are not allowed to discharge our guns in the area. It certainly is welcome to see this

change in the bill; that the road allowances will not be closed without the consent of, I believe, both the Minister of Municipal Affairs and your own department, sir. That is a very welcome change. I think the road allowances at large should only be closed with the consent of the senior government, and I would think that only in very extreme cases should they be closed.

I think we need to see some improvement in the area of farmer-hunter relationships. There has been a very marked deterioration of that relationship in the past several years. I certainly sympathize with the people on the farms who are confronted by a barrage, a steady flow of hunters to their yards seeking permission to go into their fields and along their fence lines to shoot. I suppose some don't even apply and that's probably a more serious provocation than the many who do apply. I'm sure, also, many of the so-called hunters, hopefully they are a very minimal number, but some of them do, on occasion, shoot within the restricted area too close to buildings and in trees or foliage surrounding the farmer's house and buildings, thereby causing extreme distress to the farmer's wife and children and occasionally shooting a pet bird or two. I think we have to improve the - whether it's the training that is now, or has not been, available to hunters - but possibly in the future we should be giving consideration to working with local fish and game clubs and encouraging them to support the view that before someone is given a licence he be given some sort of minimal hunter training that will encourage him to know number one, gun safety; and number two, gun and hunting courtesy, so that hunters aren't running around the farm area disturbing the farmers.

One other area I would like to comment on, Mr. Speaker, is the closing of the Brooks Hatchery. I understand it is now outdated, has a very limited capacity - something like 6,000 birds - and is required for the Brooks townsite for home development. I understand further from answers that the minister gave us a day or two back that there will be a new hatchery developed in the southern Alberta area and I would encourage him, number one, to have the hatchery established at the very earliest opportunity, without any delay. Let's get on with the job. I think a year or two without an adequate number of birds for hunting is a serious thing in the recreational area for southern Albertans and for the motel and small town merchants.

The second point would be, hopefully the hatchery would be of a sufficient size and magnitude - I don't know whether it's 100,000 or 200,000 birds carrying capacity a year - but something of a very substantial increase over what we have seen over the past 10 or 20 years has to happen, otherwise there just won't be sufficient birds available for hunting.

I think the day of, say, 15 or 20 years back when we could anticipate the natural increase through hatching the wild birds that would make available the number of birds sufficient for the hunting population - I think that day is gone. With the reduction in habitat and the increasing number of hunters, the increasing number of times that each one of us hunts, natural hatching won't do it. We'll need some sort of infusion of birds, a massive infusion of birds through a hatchery process in order that there be good hunting.

Mr. Minister, I support your bill in full and have every confidence that things will improve in the future.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on this bill, particularly on the principle of the fish and wildlife habitat provisions and the setting up of a fund.

One item does concern me, and it is, I suppose, a matter of definition. When the province developed the ponds for stocking with rainbow trout, they were usually either developed in some form of watercourse which would accumulate water in order to fill them - many of them were developed, of course, by PFRA for water storage - and fish were stocked in them. It seems to me that funds which have come from the Buck for Wildlife program or for habitat should not be used in the improvement or increasing the facilities of these particular ponds. It seems that funds that are used for habitat should be used for improving the wild habitat, not an artificially-created pond. It seems to me that other funds should be used for ponds which have been artificially created by man.

The other item in this particular program, and it relates particularly to my constituency where there is a project under the Buck for Wildlife program whereby lands were purchased from farmers which is believed to be good habitat country for pheasants. Last fall pheasants were brought up from Brooks and released in the particular area and hunters then went in on really a put-and-take basis. In fact, on some occasions the hunters arrived before the birds and it was a little disconcerting to sportsmen to see that all these hunters would gather and would be just waiting for the birds to be released. It seems to me that again, if it is to be a habitat, the birds should be there and become established before the hunters are perhaps permitted to go in. I realize that there is a loss of these birds anyway due to the winter conditions and no doubt there would have been a great loss of these birds in any event. But it did seem a little unsportsmanlike to see these guns arrive before the birds were released and then just

merely going and shooting them even, perhaps, before they had gotten a hundred yards from the release point.

The principle that a person cannot discharge a firearm on a developed road allowance unless he is hunting game birds is, I think, one which I am sure our municipalities will welcome. It's not so much of a problem perhaps in my area except that the damage that is done by firearms to signs in a municipality just means that, I think, all in all, this type of legislation will be greatly accepted. The hunting season is a short one and if a person is hunting a game bird, particularly pheasant and partridge, down the road allowance in the hunting season, I think we can tolerate that, and I think that means that the fish and game associations and sportsmen will be satisfied. But I think the other aspect, that people shouldn't be discharging guns on the developed road allowances, is a good principle and I think it will go a long way towards reducing the hunter-farmer problems within the municipalities.

Thank you.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, in this whole area of the habitat fund, I certainly can agree with the minister that it's been put to very good use now than in former days. Also, Mr. Speaker, I think that the declining bird population and the declining game population in the province, with the advent of more and more hunters, pretty well comes down to the loss of habitat. I suppose as our population will be increasing in the province we are going to see where hunting will become more and more the sport of the privileged few or the people who can afford to hunt. But some of my friends and neighbours in my constituency tell me of the good old days when the threshing machine was in operation and beside every straw pile there was a screening pile. These screenings were where your birds spent the winter. We've certainly seen in our area a complete write-off of upland birds. I suppose part of the problem now is the road allowances that are being cleaned, the fence lines that are being removed, and the type of farming, where we're farming from section to section or road line to road allowance.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to point out to you an experiment that was tried approximately four or five years ago by the Carmangay Fish and Game Association. Their membership is made up of about 50 per cent farmers and each farmer agreed to leave a strip of standing wheat, a swather-width wide, in a sheltered spot. The Carmangay Fish and Game Association has been able to boast that they have a pheasant population equal to Brooks. This is verified by the Department of Lands and Forests. Now this wheat that is in the sheltered spot with the wheat head sticking out above the snow, this is the feed that the pheasant are able to get at, they don't have to dig through the crusted snow, they don't have to go through this tremendous depth of snow.

I think definitely the Department of Lands and Forests is missing a bet by not following the example of the State of Texas. The State of Texas has allowed and encouraged its farming population to go into game farming with the idea of using it for revenue. I would surmise, Mr. Speaker, that if a farmer in this province had an area that was not really suitable for cultivation, I would say, such as a body of water, that if he would keep the livestock out of it, not burn this area, do not cut it for hay, have 15 acres that are susceptible to flooding, that if that farmer was willing to sow that area of land into barley alongside this pond, leave that barley standing or swath it for the ducks, that he should be allowed some sort of return for it. Or for instance, a farmer who plants a shelter belt and has induced a number of pheasant and prairie chickens to make a happy home there over the winter season and during the summer, perhaps we could be looking at where he could recoup some of this money.

Apparently, as I understand it, the experiment in the State of Texas has worked fairly well, and I would like to see the minister give serious consideration to allowing people in Alberta who are willing to invest in habitat, put the time and effort in habitat, to have some return. I think it would improve our upland bird situation.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to the second reading of this bill. Some of the members who have spoken this afternoon about having habitat and farming from roadside to roadside, this is maybe all good and well in some parts of the province. There are other parts of the province where this habitat has remained virtually the same for quite a number of years and there are still no more birds.

Some of the things we are overlooking, probably, are the predators such as coyotes, foxes and skunks that take a heavy toll, particularly the foxes. Now we are seeing foxes in areas where we have never seen them before; and skunks, of course, eat quite a few of the eggs of the birds in the spring. Also, hunters never take into consideration the weather, and how any pheasant is going to live north of Olds this year, I don't know what kind of bird you think it is. It has to have grain, it has to have some sort of shelter, and when the snow is two feet deep on the level, just how do you expect them to live?

When we talk about feed for birds and the hon. Member for Camrose talked about the old piles of screenings under the threshing machine, well, I agree with him that this is quite a few years ago that this happened. I would suggest the same amount of grain has been wasted under swaths, and with a combine you have grain if you can get it. Unfortunately what we can't afford all across the province is having a chinook where you can get down to the bare ground once in a while in the winter so these birds do have a chance. The natives, such as the grouse, have some sort of protection, not like the Hungarian partridge and the pheasant which are not native to this part of the country, unless they have an adequate supply of feed, and primarily they get this around the farmyards. Very few farmers have the heart - in fact there are many of them who must be commended - to feed the game birds and have them around all winter and take care of them and then have hunters come in the fall and shoot them off.

But I would like to think of the hunters, and I don't hunt myself anymore, but I don't object to people hunting if I know who they are and when they are coming on my place. But I think one of the things we have to look at and maybe the department and the Provincial Treasurer probably could be blamed for it, or take responsibility for it, that we haven't got really the fortitude or guts to close the season for a year on pheasant, grouse or partridge, or say, close it down in some zones. We are quite content to say, well, there is hunting throughout the province, particularly of upland game birds, rather than say well, in this certain zone there are not many pheasant, let's close this area down for one year. Because these birds today now are going to eat \$6 wheat, they are going to be pretty valuable.

The last one I would like to make a remark on is road allowances, and I'll probably get my neck in a sling for this. But to me road allowances were the Queen's Way. The way they were set up throughout the province, it was allowed that if we did need a road between sections, the municipality or the government didn't have to buy land. The land was already there. Now one of the members mentioned this afternoon he didn't believe - if I can remember what he said - it wasn't right, but I might not get it right either. But the idea was that you should be able to hunt on road allowances, even though they didn't lead anywhere. I suggest, as a rancher and as a farmer, that if a road doesn't lead anywhere, you have no more business on that road allowance, if it is fenced-off, then you have on a farmer's land. Because this road allowance doesn't lead anywhere, and even though it belongs to the Queen, how are you going to know if the farmer has it fenced illegally or that he is actually paying the taxes on it. And this gets into the area, we'll say, of lease on big game, that if a farmer for example, or a rancher today is paying the taxes on Crown property, he has the right of use of that Crown property and he pays the taxes on it to the municipality. I believe quite sincerely that if a farmer does pay taxes on that lease and has a bona fide lease with the Department of Lands and Forests that he should have control of that land exactly the same as if it was deeded land. Therefore, hunters should have the responsibility, if they want to hunt either for big game or for birds, that they have the right and the responsibility to ask permission to be on that land.

Most of our problems today are not with hunting and are not caused by the average hunter. They are in the same position we'll say, with alcohol The Highway and Traffic Act. They are caused by irresponsible drivers, irresponsible drinkers, and most of the trouble with hunters is caused by irresponsible hunters.

The hon. Member for Stettler talked about road signs. Well probably this is one of the reasons - they've got to shoot at something, there is nothing there to shoot, well, let's see how powerful the gun is.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I think the hon. minister, through his department, has done a good job, and as I would say, a very difficult job because I envision, it is not too long before hunting as we have known it in the past is going to be forgotten. We are going to be like the more inhabited areas, the more settled areas of Europe and the United States where hunting may be for the privileged. But certainly we have to look at it from the amount of game we have, the number of licences we issue, there has to be some relationship. To me there is no sense in it if we are going to preserve our game birds, if we are going to preserve our hawks, and in the chain of life they all have their purpose, if we are going to allow them to be hunted indiscriminately - and if I was a young fellow and you are out and there is no pheasant and a hawk jumps up, you are going to try your gun some way.

I say this as a hunter to the rural people, I think they have a greater responsibility toward the game because they see it year-round. I don't think there is the same feeling or the same response from urban people when they come out to hunt. They feel that having bought a licence, they are entitled to a bird, they are entitled to shoot something and it is really only the privilege to hunt. If there is nothing there to hunt, well, you have paid your \$4 or \$5 for the privilege of tramping around the country. But they haven't the same feel because once hunting season is over, many of them couldn't care less about the game until next year, until it is time to hunt or fish again.

So I feel in some respects the minister has rather a thankless sort of job in a way in that he has to protect not only fishing, wildlife and big game, but he has to protect it in the name of us all. And it is his department, as has already been mentioned, if his job is done properly, he probably won't get too much thanks for it. But the generations to come will benefit from the game that is left.

Thank you.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I was writing furiously and I completely lost your second point, the one between the points you made relative to roadside habitat and then the comments with respect to pheasant survival over this winter north of Olds. I just completely lost the one in between.

MR. BUCKWELL:

I don't want to be facetious, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, but I don't really know what I say when I speak unless I read Hansard.

[Laughter]

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in debate on Bill No. 30, The Wildlife Amendment Act, for second reading, I believe the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills in his contribution referred to the closing of certain road allowances by by-law. I would like the minister if he could when he closes the debate to point ... I was just referring to what I understood the Member for Calgary Foothills referred to in the closing by-laws that the municipalities now enjoy in closing of road allowances. Now I understand they can close [off the] discharge of guns and other firearms in any specified part or parts in municipalities. So I think it's wide open there in that part. Would you explain that a little further.

There are just two points I would like to deal with just briefly. One is the matter of fines. Certainly I think the increase in fines is in order. When we see the value of the dollar disappearing shall we say, well, the old schedule of fines becomes pretty minimal. Another reference to that is the increase in the wildlife crop damage where it goes from \$15 to \$25 an acre. When you had the price of wheat down at \$1.50, and it is now up at \$4.50, even the \$15 to \$25 isn't sufficient.

One point I would like the minister to refer to is the matter of local autonomy and what reference this bill has to that and what interference this bill might have. Because as I understand the existing legislation, a group of locally elected people may pass by-laws. Now what happens in this legislation I understand is that this isn't permitted, the by-law doesn't become effective unless they have two people, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Lands and Forests, giving concurrence. So I would like him to elaborate a little more on that.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to some very brief remarks on Bill No. 30, I first want to congratulate the minister on the very comprehensive remarks he made on second reading of the bill.

However, there are a few things in this particular bill I would like to have seen. One is a sort of reverse viewpoint from that held by the hon. Member for Camrose in which he expounded on the advantages of having farmers become voluntary landlords for wildlife, which is an excellent idea. I would like to refer also to the involuntary landlords. This is a very particular situation I have in my constituency.

I think probably the reason for this is the demarcation line between the winter feeding grounds of the wildlife and that which was given for settlement was not properly laid out. It may have been at the time. Whether the idea is acceptable or not, there presently is more game in my part of the province than there has ever been in my lifetime. I speak very firmly on this particular thing from personal knowledge of many, many years spent in the outdoors.

In fact, you could refer to this situation as harassment by game. This is particularly true of elk. Granted, there are certain things that a farmer can be called upon to do. He can stack his bales properly and he can slab fence it and get by to some degree. But this is an expense that is not incurred in many parts of the province, and it is a difficulty. Also, if the bales are not picked up immediately, there is a certain amount of damage that results.

There is one particular farmer who took this subject up with me. He was playing host to some 200 head of deer. I said, unfortunately there is no recourse and there is no way you can receive any remuneration, not in this world. Possibly St. Peter will give you the proper consideration at the right time. His reaction was that he was going to go down to the Indian reserve and he is going to do a selling job. Because in reality it was a menace to his means of making a living. So this is a problem that will have to be faced.

The directions that can be taken are twofold. Either the government, for all the people of the province and all the sportsmen involved, will accept some financial responsibility for what is the people's game. Or, by means of purchasing they will expand the winter grazing areas to accommodate the game that you have. Or, curtail the amount of game in a given area. These are the three solutions. I like the first two better than the third.

In reference to road allowances, I think we have to accept that there are good and sufficient reasons for closure of road allowances in some cases and for the accommodation of farmers.

However, we do face a situation because of a great unanimity of viewpoint in the Foothills Protective Association, the entire, 100 per cent, total area of the particular constituency I represent, is posted - totally. The reason for this was a succession of dry years and the alarm that farmers felt that there was a possibility of their hay crops going up in smoke. Certainly there was cause to worry.

But there is a right, as I understand it, under the law for a person to walk across a road allowance. The problem is how to identify the road allowance. You have an unbroken line of fences for miles. Most people are not surveyors. They don't know where bench marks are or corner pegs, therefore this is a genuine problem. I would think there should be some accommodation on the part of the people who use these particular road allowances, which in many cases would have no value and are not in reality access, but still have the use of being accessible to given areas of hunting. I am thinking of the eastern slope of the Livingstone range where there is no way anyone can walk across there because he does not know whether he is violating a no-trespassing sign by going through a road allowance which he cannot identify.

As I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, there is not, in reality, any way of identifying these particular things. So this is one particular area that should be clarified. There should be some accommodation to the hunter who pays his money, the accommodation of at least having some means of identifying where the road allowances are. I am not going to make a strong case for opening up closed road allowances that have no value. But I think it should be the right for citizens to walk across what is the Queen's land.

I'll touch briefly on the subject of muzzleloaders. A .44 calibre muzzleloader has far more killing power for the range it is fired than the magnum rifle. Because when firing up to 100, 150 or 200 yards - and some of the more proficient hunters in the Legislature could probably bear me out on this - the magnum bullet has a tendency to shatter with the result that you, in fact, do not have a kill. Whereas the muzzleloader, a .44 muzzleloader, with a charge of powder, is a slow-moving bullet. It has total impact and it will knock down your game. Anyone who has any reasonable competence with a muzzleloader has no difficulty in loading this up in a minute. So I would endorse muzzleloaders to the point of saying that we should look some time in the future to limiting hunting to muzzleloaders and to bows and arrows, because this will set it on a fair and equal plane insofar as the game is concerned. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this will separate the men from the boys. None of this blasting-off at a mile and a half with a .375 magnum and a 4x10 powered scope, but getting in there and sneaking up on them, a salt-shaker in one hand and a muzzleloader in the other, Mr. Speaker.

I question to some degree the accuracy of the game inventory in my particular region of the province. When I talk about that, it's not because of any local purview but simply the fact that that 30-foot stretch of land from Waterton Park and up to join the Banff National Park in fact represents a major portion of the big game hunting area in the Province of Alberta. That is for elk, for moose, for sheep and for deer. When the snow comes in the mountains, the game moves over towards the foothills. This game is scattered inside as far as the Lizard range in British Columbia. Those from the Lizard range go west to the Tobacco plains. From the Lizard range they travel east and over the Rockies and they feed along the foothills. By common custom, the game inventory is usually taken at this time of the year and right now, in the last report I got on the Castle River area alone, the inventory came to around 600 head of elk. So everyone says, lo, we have 600 head of elk. So the hunters' spirits are built up. They buy licences and they go hunting, and the 600 head of elk aren't there in the fall - fortunately for the elk. They are back on the main range. So the elk survive, and this is good.

To touch briefly on the bird hatchery. By all accounts this is not really the ideal situation. The ideal situation for the propagation of birds is, I believe, habitat. That is a fundamental. Environment or habitat for people, birds or anything else is exactly the thing that makes them grow and survive. So really a bird that's raised in a hatchery



and released - there have been some tables developed on this particular thing that indicate that it's very costly. The harvest rate of the captive birds, when they are released, is comparatively small and the survival rate over the winter is practically nil.

So with these few brief remarks I endorse Bill No. 30 and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARTON:

In adding a few comments to this bill, I commend the minister - one of few times I'll probably stand up in the Legislature and commend him. But I think this is the year that we have to look at our wildlife and look at it very, very seriously. Cut out the multi-licences, make one licence, increase the charge for the licence.

It was a hard winter and I think if we are going to make any real gut decisions this is the year to do it. You have the backing. The game in the North is in a pretty critical condition. The wolves have caused quite a havoc. The deer is completely eliminated in my area to a very few species. I think if the minister is really sincere in developing a future for Albertans, he would cut it down to one animal per person and double the licence fee.

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my feelings, too, with respect to this bill. I begin also by complimenting the minister and I'd like to express the feelings of my constituents to the extent that they are concerned about the preservation of wildlife in general, as so many have expressed. The main suggestion from all hunters in the constituency that I represent is to close the season on game birds, pheasant especially, at least for 1974, due to their scarcity, as has been mentioned.

I amplify my fellow hunters' request at a time when my emotions are the other way. I haven't hunted for a number of years for several reasons. This year I was given a beautiful purebred well-trained Labrador, and I've been looking forward to developing that companionship and restoring myself as a hunter and enjoying it as I have done in the past.

There is a lot to be said about habitat. I was reminded by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crownsnest of when we used to go over to Brooks 20 years ago or more to hunt in that area for two or three days at a time. It was in the habitat. It was in the natural willows and those cat-tails that we don't see so much any more, even in the Taber area, Vauxhall or over in the Brooks area. And unless this cover is restored I don't suppose we can possibly save the birds from winter, from heavy snows, because those heavy growths hold up the snow to a large extent. They burrow in under it.

However, I am suppressing my own emotions, as I mentioned, and recommending that we close the season for 1974. I am in favour of A Buck for Wildlife, as I mentioned, because of the need for restoring, developing and encouraging greater habitat, and especially for something for the birds to feed upon. I believe we should commence our program on this as soon as possible and collect the bucks later.

It pleases all to learn that the pheasant hatchery program, I'm sure is going to be restored and expanded and, I hope, continued. Over the years, as I remember, when the hatchery was running, that's where the concentration of birds was and they spread into other areas from where they were raising birds. It may be expensive. Whatever caused the reduction of pheasant and partridge should not be discounted. We shouldn't discount the fact that hasn't been mentioned too often, but in our area we have a regular invasion of land gulls in the spring in the irrigated areas. As soon as they start to cultivate the land they are just swarming in. Farmers have told me that they have watched them, and when the young birds have just been hatched and are running around they swoop down and pick them up, and they raid the nests too. This could be possible in our area because we have so many of these land gulls that will soon be coming in to the cultivated areas.

We in the south are interested in trophy lakes, too. Strange as it may seem, with the seven areas of these lakes in the province, there is none in the South. We'd like the minister to give some consideration to establishing or locating or inviting suggestions as to where one or two trophy lakes could be established in the south.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on the pheasant season. This is the first year that I can recall driving through the Rockyford-Strathmore-Rosebud country that I have not seen a cock pheasant or a hen pheasant. Every other year, as far as I can remember, you would not only see one but several as you drove the country roads.

At the pre-session public meetings, a number of people raised serious concern about the lack of pheasant. Some expressed the wish, as did the hon. Member for Taber-Warner a few moments ago, that there should be a closed season this coming year on pheasant. Everyone was agreed that there should be a closed season on hen pheasant. People just

feel that it's a mistake to open the season for hen pheasant and I personally feel that way. Others in meetings felt they didn't have enough information to decide whether or not the season should be closed. And that's really the way I feel. I think there has to be a very careful check made on the number of cock pheasant compared to the number of hen pheasant. If that ratio is fewer than ten hens to one cock, then it's getting pretty serious. As the hon. members who have hunted pheasant or who know anything about pheasant know, the cock pheasant is a terror with the women, and if there's a lower ratio than ten per cock, then the hen pheasant are simply worn out ...

AN HCN. MEMBER:

How about the cocks?

MR. TAYLOR:

... are chased to a frazzle by the cock pheasant.

[Laughter]

No, it doesn't work the other way with pheasants. The hens don't chase the cocks. It doesn't work that way in every case with humans either. But it is serious when that ratio drops below ten hens to one cock. I think that's the difficulty we got into a couple of years ago when the government of which I was a part decided, at least the minister decided and the government went along, that there should be a season on hen pheasant. I think it's going to take us quite a few years to get over that.

Now if the ratio of hen pheasant to cock pheasant happened to be 20 or 30 then I can understand a season on hen pheasant. It would make sense. But if that ratio is between 10 and 15, even there I would question opening a season for hen pheasant. If you have three and four cocks to fifteen hens, then I think you're in trouble. You're not going to get the best results from the game plant. I think the whole ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Exercise.

MR. TAYLOR:

... the whole story is that this is a crop, that game is a crop, and we want not only to maintain a crop for the citizens years and years ahead, we also want to maintain a crop for the pleasure of the people this year, next year and the following year.

I don't know just exactly how the people count the pheasant. Whether there's a scientific way of doing it - I suppose there is, and perhaps the hon. minister could enlighten us on that. Sometimes I have grave doubts about the results of the count, particularly in regard to a bird like the pheasant. I would suggest to the hon. minister, if the suggestion is even necessary, that there be a double and a triple check of the counts of hen pheasant and cock pheasant in order to make sure that we try to keep that ratio as close as possible to one cock to ten hens. As long as we do that, I think we continue to have a lot of pheasant for the hunting pleasure and the eating pleasure of the people of Alberta.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, if I can just very, very quickly, bring this point to the attention of the minister. It's something that's concerned me especially in relation to deer being hit by automobiles. In too many instances you don't know what to do with the animal. If we could catch all the poachers and let the innocent people go, there'd be no ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

It seems that we're getting farther and farther away from the bill. There is some doubt as to whether we should have been dealing with the plight of the pheasantry as we have, and now we're getting into deer on the roadway. I think perhaps we should come back to the bill.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I am concerned about wildlife. As far as I am concerned and as far as my humble little mind can understand, deer are wildlife. In many instances where wildlife is killed by automobiles the driver doesn't know what to do with the animal. Is this out of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is certainly discussing something of importance and interest but it doesn't relate to the bill insofar as I can see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. BUCK:

Well then, Mr. Speaker, I'll speak on wildlife habitat. Mr. Speaker, I think the minister would possibly consider this: in light of the fact that our game animals and our game birds are being rapidly depleted, if these animals and birds are to come back we must have adequate habitat for them. In pursuing this line of thought, Mr. Speaker, in the settled areas of the province we will have to pay farmers to raise habitat. In the areas that have not been cleared, I think the minister responsible could possibly look at the situation where X number of feet from the fence line would not be cleared out, because it seems if there is any way we can foul-up the ecosystem, man will find a way to do it.

So what we do is, we cut all the trees out. We remove all the habitat and then we spend millions of dollars raising trees so that we can replant the trees to re-establish the habitat.

Mr. Speaker, with the time elapsing I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 5:30 c'clock.]

